

CTE Program Equipment Fund Reviewer Rubric Template

Applicant Information						
Name of District:				CTC or Non CTC Applicant		
Name of School:						
Contact Person for this Information:				Total Amount Requested for This Program	# of Students Served Through This Program	
Program Name:						
Has this program previously received funding from the CTE Equipment Fund? If so, for how much?				\$		
When did this program previously receive CTE Equipment Funding?						
Completeness Check						
<i>For each of the items below, reviewers should indicate if submission is complete. If not, please use the notes column to elaborate.</i>						
Requirements				Complete (Y/N)	Notes	
Application is from an eligible entity						
Cover sheet is provided and contains all necessary signatures						
Program for which funds have been requested is in a GWB priority sector						
Application includes 4 narrative responses for each proposed program						
Budget is provided						
Programmatic Review						
<i>For each of the items below, reviewers should provide a score of 1-5, in alignment with the ranking system below. For any score that is rated 1 or 5, notes should be added to speak to what made the application stand out. Please complete a separate narrative review scoring chart for each proposed program (there may be multiple within a single application).</i>						
Narrative Review Program 1						
Question	1	2	3	4	5	Points
1. How will your requested one-time investment from the CTE Program equipment fund allow you to better serve students to meet the goals of one or more high skill, high growth CTE Programs?						
A. Please describe how you would use the funds. Be specific as to the rationale for each item requested.	Applicant attempts to answer the question; however, fails to include both its strategy for the use of the equipment and rationale for each item.	Applicant describes its strategy for use of equipment but does not specifically reference the general/specific type of items that it has included in the budget.	Applicant vaguely describes its strategy for use of equipment grant fund. Their answer is broken down into general categories (example "IT equipment") but is not specific to the individual items included in the budget.	Applicant clearly describes its strategy for the use of equipment grant funds. Their answer is broken down to explain the intended use of each requested item.	Applicant clearly describes its strategy for the use of equipment funds. Their answer is broken down to explain the intended use of each requested item. It is clear to the reviewer how the items come together to create cohesive support to the program.	/5
B. Include your rationale for how the	Applicant attempts to answer questions but	Applicant provides either of the	Applicant provides a statement that the	Applicant clearly describes its rationale	Applicant clearly describes its rationale for how the	/5

<p>proposed funds would support your program to achieve goals that it could not otherwise meet despite the recent influx of ESSER funds and how you will sustain your equipment after the close of the grant period.</p>	<p>fails to provide a sufficient answer (at least a 2 rating) to both:</p> <p>A rationale for how the proposed funds would support program to achieve goals that it could not otherwise meet despite the recent influx of ESSER funds.</p> <p>and a statement which explains how the equipment will be sustained after the close of the grant period.</p>	<p>following but not both:</p> <p>A rationale for how the proposed funds would support program to achieve goals that it could not otherwise meet despite the recent influx of ESSER funds.</p> <p>or</p> <p>A statement which explains how the equipment will be sustained after the close of the grant period.</p>	<p>proposed funds would advance the targeted program beyond what would be possible if the funds were not granted despite the recent influx of ESSER funds. However, applicant does not speak specifically to the types of opportunities that would be afforded through the addition of these funds.</p> <p>Applicant also provides a statement on sustainability that notes the center/LEA/school responsibility for sustaining the equipment but does not specifically speak to how the equipment will be replaced or maintained.</p>	<p>for how the proposed funds would advance the targeted program beyond what would be possible if the funds were not granted despite the recent influx of ESSER funds. Applicant speaks specifically to the types of opportunities that would be made available to students only through the addition of these funds.</p> <p>Applicant provides a statement on sustainability that includes a clear plan for either funding the replacement of equipment or covering the costs/services of ongoing maintenance.</p>	<p>proposed funds would advance the targeted program beyond what would be possible if the funds were not granted despite the recent influx of ESSER funds. Applicant speaks specifically to the types of opportunities that would be made available to students only through the addition of these funds. Response includes specific skills (technical, academic or essential) that students would gain only through the use of this equipment. Applicant provides a statement on sustainability that includes a clear plan for both funding the replacement of equipment and covering the costs/services of ongoing maintenance.</p>	
<p>C. Identify and attach evidence that demonstrates the industry relevance of this equipment. A letter of industry support for this equipment purchase is highly preferred. If such a letter is not available, please explain why not and provide alternative evidence.</p>	<p>Applicant provides a statement regarding industry relevance but does not attach any evidence to support this claim.</p>	<p>Applicant provides a thorough response explaining the industry relevance of this equipment and attempts to attach evidence of industry support. However, it is unclear to the reviewer how the evidence provided supports the claims of the applicant.</p>	<p>Applicant provides a thorough response explaining the industry relevance of this equipment and attempts to attach evidence of industry support.</p> <p>However, the evidence provided is not sufficiently aligned to the proposed equipment. For example, an industry partner could provide a letter endorsing the program but that does not speak specifically to the equipment or the applicant could provide</p>	<p>Applicant provides a thorough response explaining the industry relevance of this equipment and attaches evidence of industry support for the equipment that is less directly aligned than a letter. This may include, but is not limited to: news articles, research papers, Prepare RI reports or preceding notes from a meeting focused on this sector and the specific equipment.</p>	<p>Applicant provides a thorough response explaining the industry relevance of this equipment and attaches two letter of support from an industry partner affirming this statement.</p>	<p>/5</p>

			other evidence of industry alignment that does not address the need for the specific items requested.			
2. What is the length of impact for each item of equipment that you have requested?	Applicant attempts to answer this question but fails to specifically provide a timeline for equipment use and also fails to provide an appropriate plan for maintenance.	Applicant provides either a vague description of the life of the equipment requested or a plan for appropriate maintenance BUT does not sufficiently answer both questions.	Applicant describes the life of the equipment requested but speaks in general terms and does not differentiate by item. Applicant provides a statement that they will maintain and repair equipment but does not provide a specific funding source.	Applicant clearly describes the life of the equipment requested (by individual item) and includes an estimated timeline for replacement or updating. Applicant provides a clear plan for addressing maintenance and depreciation but their response may rely solely on state allocations (Perkins, Categorical)	Applicant clearly describes the life of the equipment requested (by individual item) and includes an evidence-based timeline for replacement or updating. Applicant provides a clear plan for addressing maintenance and depreciation. Applicant does not rely solely on state allocations but also will leverage local dollars for this purpose.	/5
3. If we were only able to provide a partial award for your grant, which considerations should we have in mind?	Applicant fails to identify priorities or attach them to individual items. And/or Applicant responds n/a without a rationale for why this question is not applicable.	Applicant provides a general statement of priorities but it is unclear to the reviewers how this relates to the items included in the budget.	Applicant provides a vague explanation of the considerations that RIDE should have in mind when offering partial awards and project interdependencies but does not speak to specific items. Or applicant notes that interdependencies do not exist but does not include a statement explaining why or which priorities exist.	Applicant provides a clear set of priority items for its grant, should only a partial award be made. The response includes a specific rationale for why certain items are priority and any interdependencies that exist. Or Applicant clearly describes why interdependencies do not exist.	Applicant provides a clear set of priority items for its grant, should only a partial award be made. The response includes a specific rationale for why certain items are priority and any interdependencies that exist. Applicant provides one or more scenarios for how RIDE might allocate partial funding.	/5
4. If applicant LEA has successfully applied for this funding source in prior years, please re-state the funding amount awarded and	Applicant fails to demonstrate the impact of the prior funding amount on the program(s). And/or	Applicant demonstrates that the prior funding amount on the program(s) had limited impact . And/or	Applicant demonstrates some impact that this funding opportunity had on the program(s) but only tangential alignment to the LEA's	Applicant demonstrates both the impact that this funding opportunity had on the program(s) <u>and</u> how it supported the LEA's 2020 CLNA's goals/objectives.	Applicant convincingly demonstrates the strong impact that this funding opportunity had on the program(s) <u>and</u> how it clearly supported the	/5

the impact this funding opportunity had on the program(s) operations plus how this investment supported the LEA's 2020 Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment goals/objectives.	Applicant fails to show how this investment supported the 2020 CLNA's goals/objectives.	Applicant shows that this investment only loosely supported the 2020 CLNA's goals/objectives.	2020 CLNA's goals/objectives.		LEA's 2020 CLNA's goals/objectives.	
Total Points	**FOR Q4, IF LEA HAS NOT RECEIVED PRIOR FUNDING, INDICATE "N/A" IN THE POINTS COLUMN AND USE 25 TOTAL POINTS INSTEAD OF 30 POINTS.					/30
						/25
Budget Review						
<i>Reviewers should provide a Yes or No answer to each of the following considerations. If answer is a "no" or if reviewer is unsure if answer is complete, he/she should make note of why in the notes column.</i>						
Is the budget reflective of/aligned to the narrative?						
Are the line items clearly labeled and broken down by the specific equipment requested?						